

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/728,138	PROVOST ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeff H. Aftergut	1733	

All Participants:

(1) Jeff H. Aftergut.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(2) Celia Leber.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 23 August 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

all

Claims discussed:

all

Prior art documents discussed:

all

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed a need to recite in the independent claims that the carrier sheet was in the form of a film of material as the only manner described for forming the claimed projections was to employ a film as the carrier sheet. It was noted that there was no evidence to suggest that the forked needles with the carrier sheet of film cooperated to form the specified projections and that there was no motivation to utilize both the forked needles and the carrier film in the process of PCT '680. Indicated that inclusion of the carrier sheet as being a film would place all claims in condition of allowance and additionally indicated that previously withdrawn claims directed to various species would be rejoined with the allowed generic claims. Applicant's representative agreed to the proposed changes via examiner's amendment.